



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Contrast this with the military establishments of Christendom. With a population of little more than 200,000,000, she maintains even in peace between three and four millions of soldiers; an average of one soldier to about 70 inhabitants; while China, if we reckon only her 80,000 Tartars, has barely one to 4,512, and, if we include her 700,000 militia, only one to 463; a proportion, according to the first estimate, of less than one to 600, and, according to the second, of little more than one to seven, in comparison with nations reputedly Christian. With less than fifteen millions of people, we ourselves have on our militia rolls probably 1,500,000, an average of one soldier to ten inhabitants, while China has at most only one to 463!

Is it possible to conceive a fouler libel on Christianity, a keener satire on her professions of universal peace and goodwill? Christendom an immense range of barracks, a nursery of warriors, a vast slaughter-yard drenched age after age with Christian blood, shed by baptized hands! Such a religion offer peace to China! Could we make the Chinese credit such a promise, belied by the whole history of warring Christendom? Yet the church, which has for centuries upheld this accursed system as an ordinance of God! is said, even by some professed friends of peace, to have been in all ages essentially correct on this subject!! and the gospel, *as thus understood and practised*, is confidently expected to banish war from the face of the earth!!

---

#### HISTORY OF NANTUCKET.

##### *An illustration of the efficacy of pacific principles.*

Our secretary, who visited this interesting island last spring, was presented with a copy of its history, by Obed Macy, from which we might, would our limits allow the slightest sketch, gather many facts to illustrate the safety and wisdom of a pacific policy.

The persecution of the Quakers led to the settlement of this island. Thomas Macy, having given shelter in his house at Salisbury, Mass., to four Quakers for three quarters of an hour in a rain-storm, was compelled to seek among savages an asylum from the intolerance of our forefathers; and, in the autumn of 1659, he took his family, in an open boat, around Cape Cod to Nantucket, of which the patent-right had already been

purchased by ten men belonging to Salisbury. These purchasers soon after associated with themselves ten more, and subsequently extended the shares to twenty-seven, by inviting seven mechanics to settle with them. This division of the island into twenty-seven shares, called *commonage*, continues to the present day, with a large number of subdivisions.

The whole history of Nantucket is curious and deeply interesting; but we are concerned mainly with the progress of its pacific policy. This policy did not originate with the Quakers; for they had no meeting or society there till half a century after the settlement of the island, and they have always formed only a small minority. The great body of the people have never adopted the strict principles of peace; but, influenced chiefly by their situation and employment, they have from the first entertained "a strong and almost universal opinion, that wars are wrong." They suffered intensely from our last and the revolutionary war; but their well-known aversion to war has proved a far better shield to them than fleets and fortifications could have been. Exposed on all sides, without the possibility of defence, without a single fort, arsenal, or military company, they have been left secure in their homes, and permitted to enjoy in war exemptions and privileges granted to no others. Nantucket, though utterly defenceless, was actually safer from plunder and conflagration "than fortified seaports, or even many inland towns."

Our militia system is entirely disregarded on this island. Nor is it found necessary for the enforcement of law, or any domestic or foreign purposes of government. The people, almost to a man, are opposed to its introduction; and no military organization of any kind has ever been attempted with any success. Public opinion executes law; and their pacific character is a surer guarantee against foreign invasion than a rampart bristling with cannon all around the island. This is not mere theory, but the actual result of experiments tried there for nearly two hundred years.

The book before us vividly illustrates the evils inseparable from war. Look at one of the slightest,—the enhancement of all the necessities of life. Before the Revolution, molasses was 2s 6d per gallon, butter 10d per lb., wheat 6s per bushel, and wood 14s per cord; but the prices rose at once to 13s for molasses, 5s 7½d for butter, £7 per cwt. for flour, and £5 12s 6d for wood. The sufferings of the people from want and anxiety were extreme; but we have no room for the details.

We commend the following remarks of our author to the attention of those who seem unable to conceive any other means than the sword of resisting oppression, and vindicating our rights.

“If we could justify any war, it would be that of the Revolution. Repeated injuries were heaped upon the colonists, which, we allow, it was their duty to notice, in a firm and decided manner. Respecting, as we do, and that most sincerely, the rights of man, we have little sympathy with those who supinely submit to unprovoked injuries. In the dignity of Christian charity we bear and forbear, but our endurance then is a defence which even tyranny will eventually respect. To feel an injury, and to revenge it, are very different things: the highest merit of forbearance consists in the keenest sense of wrong. While, then, we would bear testimony against all wars, and every species of violence between man and man, we would encourage all to defend their social and individual rights, to cherish self-respect, and maintain their independence; and we believe that there are ample means for this purpose, without resort to blood, and that wars and fightings are the causes, rather than the remedies of oppression. A course of proceeding which throws two nations into mourning over the harm which they have reciprocally done to each other, seems a strange way of deciding between right and wrong. Let the consequences of war be considered apart from the vain glory, and martial equipments, and mighty enterprises, and great talents, and enthusiastic excitement, which are associated with it; let plunder, and rapine, and death; let ghastly wounds, mutilated limbs, loathsome disease, and famine and poverty; let the widow, the childless, the orphan; let the crimes of lawless passion, and the permanent injury to moral and Christian virtues, be considered, and who will say that wars are the best means, nay, who will say that they should ever be resorted to, for the purpose of deciding a national dispute?

---

LORD BROUGHAM'S COMPARISON OF CHRISTIANS WITH PAGANS ON  
THE SUBJECT OF WAR.

Lord Brougham, in his discourse on natural theology, says “that Plato and other theists enumerate three kinds of blasphemy, all three of which are, in the republic of Plato, made equally punishable with death. The first species is denying the existence of a deity, or of gods. The second, admitting their existence, but denying that they care for men. The third kind of blasphemy was that of men attempting to propitiate the gods towards criminal conduct, as slaughters and outrages upon justice, by prayers, thanksgivings and sacrifices; thus making those pure beings the accomplices of their crimes, by sharing with them a small portion of the spoil, as the wolves do with the dogs.” On these views of Plato, Lord Brougham adds in a note, “Who can read these, and such passages as these, without wishing that some who call themselves Christians, some Christian principalities and powers, had taken a lesson from the heathen sage, and,